MMERCE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT Patent and Trademark Office

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Westington, O.C. 20231

PISH & RICHARDSON 225 FRANKLIN STREET BOSTON, MA 02111-2804 This is communication less two workship in burgers of prove application. COMMUNICATION AND TRUTEMARKS. This is communication less two workship in burgers of prove application. COMMUNICATION AND TRUTEMARKS. This is communication less two workship in burgers of prove application. COMMUNICATION AND TRUTEMARKS. This production has been examinated. A shortward statutory ported for response to this solden is and to explain 3 months. A shortward statutory ported for response to this solden is and to explain 3 months. A shortward statutory ported for response to this solden is and to explain 3 months. A shortward statutory ported for response to this solden is and to explain 3 months. A shortward statutory ported for response to this solden is and to explain 4. A shortward statutory ported for response to this solden is and to explain 4. This produce of Arc Code by Applicant, PTO-1424. B. Modes or Patient Desarting, PTO-048. B. Modes or Reference Created by Examiner, PTO-1474. B. Modes or Patient Desarting, PTO-048. C. Other above, delating of the short o	SERIAL NUL	RIAL NUMBER FILING DATE PRET NAMED INVENTOR		AMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.		
FISH & RICHARDSON 225 FRANKL IN STREET BOSTON, MA 02111-2804 ART Use FAPTER RURGETS 2311 S	07/566,	083	98/10/90	KRUG		K		
FISH & RICHARDSON 225 FRANKL IN STREET BOSTON, MA 02111-2804 ART Use FAPTER RURGETS 2311 S	•			•	•		~~	
APT UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2311 8 2311 231		·					EXAMMER	
DATE MAILED: 01/15/92 This application has been examined Responsive to communication Stad on This action is made final. A shortered statutory particl for response to this action is set to expire month(A) days from the date of this later. Fallow is inequal within the period for response will cause the application to become ehemotrand. SELLEJO. 133 PART I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(R) ARE PART OF THER ACTION: 1. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1468. days from the date of this later. 1. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 1. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 1. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 1. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 2. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 2. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 2. Others of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 3. Others of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 4. Others of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 5. Others Clouds of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 6. Others Clouds of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 7. This application has been flood with informal drawings under 97 C.P.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Clouds are Patent Disaving, PTO-403. date proved by the examiner (see explanation). later of the date of the date for printing under 97 C.P.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 10. The purposed drawing correction, field on the condition of the date for printing under 97 C.P.R. 1.85				• ,	1 .			
DATE MAILED: 01/15/92 This application has been examined Responsive to communication Stad on This action is made final. A shortered statutory particl for response to this action is set to expire month(A) days from the date of this later. Fallow is inequal within the period for response will cause the application to become ehemotrand. SELLEJO. 133 PART I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(R) ARE PART OF THER ACTION: 1. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1468. days from the date of this later. 1. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 1. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 1. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 1. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 2. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 2. Injudice of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 2. Others of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 3. Others of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 4. Others of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 5. Others Clouds of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 6. Others Clouds of References Cloud by Examines, PTO-1474. days from the date of this later. 7. This application has been flood with informal drawings under 97 C.P.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Clouds are Patent Disaving, PTO-403. date proved by the examiner (see explanation). later of the date of the date for printing under 97 C.P.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 10. The purposed drawing correction, field on the condition of the date for printing under 97 C.P.R. 1.85				Jakes	JE.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
This is communication less the manifest in unergo of your apparation. This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on This action is made final.	•			QM	•	2311	8	
This experience is no the acceptable is charge of your application. CORRESCIONES OF PATENTS AND TRUTKENARIOS This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on						DATH MAILED:		
This application has been examined							1.1 1	
A shortered statutory period for response to this action is set to expire	COMMISSIONER CO	rasena 4	S AND TRADELARKS	3			4/10/94 0	
A shortered statutory period for response to this action is set to expire	·				•		7/15/9,00	
A shortered statutory period for response to this action is set to expire	•				•		1	
Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTIS) ARE PART OF THES ACTIONS: 1.	This application t	h as bee n	examined 🔲 Red	tponsive to communical	ton filed on	C	This action is made final.	
Father to respond with the period for response will cause the application to become ebendoned. 33 U.S.C. 133 Part 1 THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTITY ARE PART OF THES ACTIONS: 1. Mystoc of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-992. 2. Notice or Patient Drawing, PTO-948. 8. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. 4. Notice of Informal Patient Application, Form PTO-152 BUILDMARY OF ACTION 1. Cizims	A shortened statutory	period to	r response to this act	fon le set to expire	3month(e),	days for	n the date of this letter.	
1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-1428. 8. Notice of An Cited by Applicant, PTO-1448. 8. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. 9urt II SUMMARY OF ACTION 1. Citems	Failure to respond with	hin the p	eriod for response wil	onuse the application (to become abandone	1. 65 U.S.O. 133		
Notice of Art Clear by Applicant, PTC-1449. Notice of Informal Pashna Application, Form PTC-152	Part I THE FOLLO	WING AT	TACHMENT(S) ARE	PART OF THIS ACTIO	Mir.			
Notice of Art Clear by Applicant, PTC-1449. Notice of Informal Pashna Application, Form PTC-152	1. A Notice of	Reference	se Cited by Examiner	PTO-892	i a 🗆 Notice	m Detact Drowless	PTO.048	
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION 1. Claims								
Claims	8. Informatio	n on How	to Effect Drawing C?	ianges, PTO-1474.	• 🗆	····		
Of the above, dating	Part II SUMMARY	OF ACT	ON				:	
Of the above, dating	· Carrie		1-6	4				
Claims			•				_ are pending in the application.	
### Claims ### are valided. ### Claims ### are valided. ### Claims ### are objected to. #### Claims ### are objected to. ### Claims ### are objected to. #### Claims ### are objected to. #### Claims ### are objected to. #### Claims #### are objected to. ###################################	Off	the above	, daims	* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u>:</u>		re withdrawn from consideration.	
4. Otalms	2. Claims			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u> </u>	have been cancelled.	
4. Otalms	3. Cialms						em efferred	
6. Claims								
are subject to restriction or election requirement. 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under \$7 C.F.R. 1.65 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on	_						are reposed.	
7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.65 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on	5. L.J Claims							
8. Formet drawings are required in response to this Office action. 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on	6. Claims		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			a subject to matrici	ion or election requirement.	
8. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on	7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.							
are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948). 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on	8. Tormel dre	nvings an	e required in respons	e to this Office action.				
The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on	9. The correc	ted or su	belitute drawings hav	e been received on	<u> </u>	Unde	r 87 C.F.R. 1,64 these drawings	
examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed	ero 🗆 ec	ceptable	not acceptable (see explanation or Not	ce re Patent D <i>rawli</i> ng.	PTO-048).		
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed					on	, has (have) been	approved by the	
Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under U.S.O. 119: The certified copy has been received not been received been field in perent application, serial no. field on 18. Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merita is closed in accordance with the practice under Exparte Queyte, 1935 G.D. 11; 453 O.G. 218. 14. Other Docketed	examiner;	☐ disag	proved by the existric	ner (see explanation).				
been field in perent application, serial no.	11. 🔲 The propor	ed drawl	ng correction, filled	· · ·	has been 🔲 appro-	ved; 🔲 despprove	d (see explanation).	
18. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merite is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parts Queyte, 1935 C.D. 11; 455 O.Q. 213. 14. Other Docketed							sived 🔲 not been received	
Docketed Action Code 3MMCT Base Date 112-92 Due Date 4:15-92 Final Deadline 7:12-72 Docketed by MAY 1 9 1992 MAY 1 9 1992 First & C. H.	U been fi	ed in pen	ent application, serial	nc	; #\$60 on			
Docketed Action Code 3MMer Base Date 12.22 Due Date 4:15.92 Final Deadline 7:15.72 Docketed by May 1 9 1992 MAY 1 9 1992 First & C. H. C.						y's, prosecution as t	o the merits is closed in	
Docketed Action Code 2MMCT Base Date 112-92 Due Date 4-15-92 Pinal Deadline 7-15-72 Docketed by MAY 1 9 1992 MAY 1 9 1992 First & C. H. C. M.		T WELL THE	buscann number ex ba	um cirmine' i nego (1777 i	11; 488 O.G. Eld.	•		
Action Code 3MMer. Base Date 12.23 Due Date 4:15.92 Final Deadline 7:15.72 Docketed by 500 MAY 1 9 1992 First & Code 3MMer. MAY 1 9 1992 First & Code 3MMer. MAY 1 9 1992	14. [Other		 		l .	1		
Base Date 12.72 Due Date 4:15.92 Final Deadline 7:15.72 Docketed by Editor MAY 1 9 1992 First & Communication of the second seco			Action Code	keted . 3MACT	:	¥ 		
Pinel Deadline 7.15.72 Dooketed by France MAY 1 9 1992 First & County 1 1992			Base Date		DECKIVE	B PEC	EIVEN	
Docketed by MAY 1 9 1950		•		4-15-72	•			
I LEAD OF COMMENT OF THE COMMENT OF					MAY 1 9 195	Z JAN	1-1 1992	
				,	**	TEN S C		

YNAMINER'S ACTION

- 1. Claims are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See M.P.E.P. § 608.01(n). Accordingly, these claims have not been further treated on the merits.
- 2. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

Claim 56 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because it is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The invention as recited in claim 56 is directed to a lookup table. The Examiner respectfully asserts that the a table is an arrangement of data which does not fall within any of the statutory areas recited above. It is neither an apparatus or process but is more akin to printed matter. For this reason, the Examiner respectfully asserts that the invention as recited in claim 56 is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear from current claim language it is unclear whether the invention is directed to an apparatus or a method.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

A. Claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Rutt in view of Delange.

Rutt et al. is directed to a tomography system which makes use of dual energy levels to inspect a patient (i.e., an ensemble of physical objects). The system includes means to generate images of structures found within the patient. The Examiner respectfully asserts that the displayed image of the Rutt system includes various subareas comprising the image. The image is of course representative of the attenuation of x-rays at each energy level. The invention as recited in claim 12 differs from Rutt in that means to compare differences in attenuation of subareas is recited as well as means to indicate the presence of specific material based on the comparisons.

Delange is directed to a system for determination contrasting objects within an image. In order to detect the presence of an object, the Delange system functions to compare background values

with luminance values for each pixel. Those pixels having a greater value contrast with the background and are thus objects. The Examiner respectfully asserts that once the image is obtained using the Rutt system one skilled in the art would be free to chose any readily available means for processing the image data such as that disclosed by Delange. Claim 12 is rejected

As discussed in the rejection of claim, the Rutt-Delange combination includes means for detecting a specific material (i.e., a specific organ in the body) on the basis of comparisons of dual energy transmission information. Finally, the Delange system discloses comparisons of selected subareas (i.e., each pixel) and if data is obtained through use of the Rutt system, the data compared via the Delange system would be on the basis of dual energy x-rays. Claim 1 is rejected.

Use of dual energy x-rays to detect items has been discussed above. The Examiner respectfully asserts that specification of the item to be detected as a bomb is a design choice. Claim 2.

The Examiner respectfully asserts that if two energy levels are needed one obvious method would be to generate the necessary levels from the source. Further, colliminating means are well known in the tomography area and the object must intercept the x-ray beam in order for attenuation data to be generated. Claim 34 is rejected.

The Delange-Rutt combination makes use of display means. Further, Delange makes use of pixel comparison means to detect an

object in a video image. Claim 3 is rejected.

Claims 36-45 recite specific examples of the material being detected. The Examiner respectfully asserts that it would be a matter of design choice which of the numerous existing items would be imaged using the Rutt-Delange combination. Specification of the item to be imaged does not alter the device which is used for imaging. These claims are therefore rejected.

B. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over any computer stored table. Use of tables as form of storing data in computers is well known. The Examiner respectfully asserts that the particular data stored therein is a design choice and does not constitute a patentable difference. Claim 56 is rejected.

-REMARKS-

Page 69 makes reference to an attached appendix. None is however found with the specification. Was an appendix in fact submitted?

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gail Hayes whose telephone number is (703) 308-1670.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 0754.

-6-

Serial No. 07/566,083 Art Unit 2311

g.o.h. December 16, 1991

GAIL O. HAYES
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 230